


Traversal is on the ground that there would not be undue burden in examining two groups of claims in a single application. In particular, MPEP § 808 makes it clear that in order to require restriction between independent or distinct inventions, reasons for insisting upon a restriction requirement, such as undue burden, must also be shown. In the present instance, it is not believed that there would be an undue burden in examining the claims of Groups I and II in a single application, since the two groups of claims are not so different as would require a burden on the Examiner that is significantly beyond that of the normal burdens of examination.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are respectfully requested.

Turning to the requirement to elect between allegedly distinct species, Applicant hereby provisionally elects to prosecute Embodiment I, namely the embodiment depicted in Figs. 1A to 8.

Claims 1 to 4 and 9 to 11 read on the elected species of Embodiment I. Applicant believes that Claim 1 is generic. The election is made without traverse.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted, 

Michael K. O'Neill  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 100207v1